



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

better to publish the index itself, in connection with communications which throw light upon it.

"TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE PARISH OF GLANWORTH.

"DEAR FRIENDS—You are, perhaps, aware that recently a prospect presented itself that, by the mutual co-operation of the Roman Catholic clergyman of the parish and myself, an arrangement might be made, whereby the Roman Catholic translation of the inspired Scriptures might be brought within the reach of each of you; that thus you might possess, and search for yourselves the Sacred Volume. I regret that this expectation of co-operation for your benefit has been frustrated, by the Roman Catholic curate, on Saturday last, declining to carry out the plan we had agreed on a fortnight before. The reason which he assigned to me for this was, that I had in view 'ulterior objects, and a cunning design,' alleging that such was evident, from my expressed intention of providing also for sale the Protestant translation of the Bible. I cannot see how the exercise of my unquestionable right to supply to any who desire to purchase it a Protestant Bible, should interfere with any benefit to be derived from the dissemination of the Roman Catholic version also. That I have 'ulterior objects' in view, in endeavouring to place the Bible within your reach, is no 'cunning design,' but an open and a candid one. My primary object simply is, that you should come to the knowledge of what the prophets, and evangelists, and apostles of our Lord taught and recorded. And my final aim is, that, through the knowledge of the truth, your souls may be saved in the great day of the Lord.

"That Mr. O'Mullane would persevere in his expressed intention of sanctioning the circulation of his own version of the Scriptures, I hardly expected. It would be a boon too large and liberal for Rome to confer—permission to purchase cheaply and unrestrictedly even their own version, without note or human comment. But in what position does his withdrawing from the arrangement leave the matter? Personally Mr. O'Mullane has exhibited the liberality of his own sentiments, and has marked his opinion of the unreasonableness of withholding the Bible, by disavowing all opposition to the reading of the Romish translation of the Scriptures. You have, therefore, I conclude, his permission for obtaining and reading it, when and where you can. But the open sanction to its indiscriminate sale he is not permitted by his Church to give. Witness the 4th rule of the Index of the Council of Trent, and various other authorities. Opposition, therefore, between the Church of Rome and the Word of God is palpable: there is no mistake about the matter. Romanism and Scripture cannot stand together; one must yield the place; and Rome is determined she will not; and, therefore, if she can, the Bible must. However inconvenient it may be, surrounded by Protestant light and liberty, to avow this principle, it is evident that practically she acts on it; and withholds, as far as in her lies, from the people she can influence, a knowledge even of her own translation of the Word of God.

"Have you ever read the declaration of the Saviour, in the Gospel of St. John iii. chap. 19 v. (Douay version)—'This is the judgment, because the light is come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than the light: for their works were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light and cometh not to the light, that his works may not be reproved. But he that doth truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, because they are done in God.'

"And again, John v. 39—'Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting; and the same are they that give testimony of me.'

"And St. Paul, in his 2nd Epistle to Timothy, 4th chap., 15 to 17 verse—'From thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work.' And Isaiah chap. viii. 20—'To the law rather and to the testimony. And if they speak not according to this word they shall not have the morning light.'

"Reading these plain statements of Christ our Lord and his apostles and prophets, can you reconcile the strenuous opposition which the Church of Rome exhibits to the free circulation of the Scriptures, with a consciousness that her doctrines will bear comparison with the testimony of that word? No, dear friends; Rome knows well that her system and Scripture are irreconcilable, and therefore she withholds the Scriptures from the mass of her people. Witness the fact, that the Bible is a contraband article in Italy. Witness the fact, that in Ireland the Bible is an unknown book among multitudes of Roman Catholics; and when the Word of God is spoken of, they often conceive the expression to refer to their own Prayer Book. Witness the shrinking from the performance of his late agreement, by the Roman Catholic curate of this parish, as well as his declining my proffered challenge to a fair and public discussion of our respective principles. Watch, and note whether any measures will be adopted for bringing your own version of the Bible within your reach.

"But Mr. O'Mullane further urged as a reason for withdrawing from the arrangement, that I would take occasion to speak to you on religious subjects. Well, what if I do? The freedom of speech of a British subject, and a Protestant minister, does not depend on his sanction to the circulation of the Bible; nor can his withholding that sanction seal my lips. One might suppose that if your principles be in accordance with the Word of God, a knowledge of that Word would fortify you against any attempt to overthrow those principles. I cannot see how withholding the Bible can weaken my cause, unless the Bible be in my favour. If indeed, as I allege, the testimony of the Bible be a confirmation of the principles he fears I would disseminate among you, all is plain enough. But what is made plain? That Rome is necessitated to keep the people in ignorance of the Scriptures, that she may keep them in communion with herself.

"One subject more I must allude to. Mr. O'Mullane, in our recent conversation, attempted to work upon my fears. He warned me against speaking to you on religious subjects, on pain of your scorn. Scorn and insult my Master suffered for the truth's sake, and he has taught me, 'the servant is not greater than his master.' 'It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the good man of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household. Therefore fear them not, for nothing is covered that shall not be revealed, nor hid that shall not be known. That which I tell you in the dark, speak ye in the light, and that which you hear in the ear, preach ye upon the housetops,' &c. &c.—John xv. 20, and Matt. x. 25, &c. But Mr. O'Mullane hinted at more substantial matter of apprehension. He little knows the provision which the Bible makes to prepare the Christian for all contingencies in the path of duty. He must surely have forgotten—when he warned me thus 'as a friend'—that there is another 'Friend who sticketh closer than a brother,' and who had previously warned me thus—'I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you fear him.'

"Mr. O'Mullane has warned me of scorn, and hinted at more serious consequences. I hold him answerable for either insult or injury, should such be offered. But such I do not anticipate. My experience of your uniformly friendly and courteous demeanour assures me that harmony and good feeling must continue to prevail between us, unless there be a strong stimulus applied to alter the genuine tendencies of your naturally kindly feelings. You will not consider me 'an enemy because I tell you the truth.'

"In conclusion, allow me to assure you of the entire cordiality with which I desire the promotion of your best interests, and of my studious endeavour to avoid all approach to personal offence; while I speak the truth, it is in love; and surely you have too much manly and honourable feeling to think evil in your hearts of an honest man who candidly and faithfully speaks his mind in the language of a gentleman and the spirit of a Christian minister.

"One request I must earnestly make of you—Ask God, for Jesus Christ's sake, to give to you and to me his Holy Spirit—that by him all prejudice and ignorance may be removed, in whichever quarter they may exist; that we may each be guided or preserved in the knowledge, and belief, and love of the truth; and that our precious souls may be saved through Christ for ever. I am, Dear Friends, your faithful servant in Christ,

JOHN ALDWORTH.

Rectory, Glanworth, 9th August, 1852."

WARNER CHRISTIAN SEARCH AND THE FATHERS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY ON PURGATORY.

In our number for June we published a letter from "A Catholic," asking that some one would publish in our paper the testimonies to the existence of purgatory which the Fathers of the first three centuries have left us.

This letter was answered, in our number for July, by "W. C. Search," who mixed up in his answer the Fathers of the three first centuries and the Fathers of the fourth century also. We then answered the proofs which "W. C. Search" gave from the Fathers of the three first centuries; and we stated our reason why on that occasion we confined ourselves to what he had brought from those three centuries—viz., because those only could be any answer to the letter to which he undertook to reply.

Our readers will remember, or, if not, by looking back to our number for July, page 82, column 2, they will see the result of our examination of the authorities which "W. C. Search" produced from the three first centuries. The result of our examination of them was as follows:—"We have now gone over all the witnesses that 'W. C. Search' has brought for purgatory, from the first three hundred years of the Christian Church. They are only two! One of them believed only after he

left the Catholic Church and became a heretic; the other, who was always a Catholic, never believed it at all. We are now entitled to take it as established that this notion of purgatory was no doctrine of the Gospel of the Church for three hundred years. Whenever it came in afterwards, it was an invention of men."

To this no reply has been made: no one has attempted to question our proofs as to those two witnesses; and no one has attempted to bring any other witnesses from the first three hundred years. We are, therefore, entitled to consider the above statement as unanswerable until some one can be found to answer it.

At that time we left out "W. C. Search's" proofs from the fourth century, because they had nothing to do with the letter he undertook to answer; but we said that we would consider them separately on some other occasion, and we now propose to do so.

Here we ask our readers to refer to "W. C. Search's" letter, which they will find in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for July, page 87, column 1. In the paragraph marked 4 "W. C. Search" quotes, from the historian Eusebius, the account of the Emperor Constantine's funeral. [We hope our readers always preserve the back numbers of the LAYMAN to refer to; but in case any do not, we here reprint this part of "W. C. Search's" letter.]

"In this manner did Constantine perform the last duties in honour of his father. But when he had departed with his guards, the ministers of God, surrounded by the multitude of the faithful, advanced into the middle space, and with prayers performed the ceremonies of Divine worship: the prince reposing in his coffin, and the people in concert with the priests, not without sighs and tears, offered up prayers to heaven for the repose of his soul, in this manifesting the most acceptable service to a religious prince. The deceased emperor was thus admitted to a participation in the religious rites, the mystic sacrifice and holy suffrages of the faithful—Eusebius de Vita Constant., lib. 2."

The place from which this is taken is the fourth book, c. 71, and not the second book, as referred to by "W. C. Search."

We have already said that we never correct translations through mere pedantry. There is much in the above that is wrong, but we correct only what affects the argument. "W. C. Search" has marked these words in italics—"offered up prayers to heaven for the repose of his soul."

We have already observed how fond Roman Catholics are of putting in the word "repose" where the writer never put it. The Greek has no more than this—"Offered up prayers for the soul of the emperor." Even this might as well be translated differently—"offered up prayers for the life of the emperor." It might as well be translated of prayers offered for the life of the living Emperor Constantine, as for the soul of the dead Emperor Constantine. But we are willing to take it as if it meant the latter; and then the question will be, whether these were prayers for a soul in purgatory or thanksgiving for a soul in heaven. And here we must observe, that "W. C. Search," for some reason of his own, leaves out a passage from the middle of his quotation, without giving any notice that he does so. And part of what he leaves out is as follows:—"That God thus gave to Constantine 'the things which were desired by him—a place in the memorial of the Apostles—the habitation of a thrice blessed soul, having equally glorified him with the appellation of the Apostles.'" Thus, it appears that the nature of this service was simply joining the Emperor Constantine in the same memorial, or remembrance, which they made of the Apostles themselves! Whether this were rightly done, or whether it were not rather a flattery of the deceased emperor to please the living one, is not the question here; but surely it can be no testimony that they who did this believed that the soul of Constantine was in purgatory! Were the Apostles, then, in purgatory? And when those flattering priests joined Constantine in the remembrance which they made of the Apostles, does that prove that they thought Constantine's soul was in purgatory?

Let it be remembered that this passage is none of our seeking; it is one of the proofs that "W. C. Search" brings for purgatory in the fourth century, because there was no better to be had.

The passage appears to us very strong indeed the other way; for the Emperor Constantine, though he had some good points, was far from being a holy man. If, then, there had been such a place as purgatory, he was a very fit person to go there; and since these priests never dreamed of his going there, it is clear they could have no notion of such a place.

"W. C. Search" next quotes St. Cyril of Jerusalem, also of the fourth century, as follows—"There (in the Sacrifice of the Mass) we pray for the holy Fathers and the bishops that are dead; and, in short, for all those that are departed this life in our communion; believing that the souls of those for whom the prayers are offered receive very great relief (it should be advantage) while this holy and tremendous victim is upon the altar—Catech. Myst. 5, pages 297, 298. Read prior and subsequent to this quotation."

We have read as directed, and we find that all this is

* These words are "W. C. Search's," not St. Cyril's.

said of patriarchs, prophets, APOSTLES, and MARTYRS, as well as of holy fathers and bishops, and of all who died in our communion. Were all these in purgatory? Surely the Church of Rome at the present day will tell "W. C. Search" that the apostles and martyrs were never in purgatory at all. Hence it is clear, that commemorations which were made for apostles and martyrs, as much as for all other faithful departed, could have nothing to do with purgatory. Does the Church of Rome include apostles and martyrs now in her purgatorial prayers? Does she not say that it would be an heretical impiety to do so? Clearly, then, these "commemorations" were not purgatorial.

"W. C. Search" thus quotes St. Chrysostom—"Not without reason was it ordained by the Apostles that, in celebrating the sacred mysteries, the dead should be remembered." "W. C. Search" points this in capital letters; and, of course, he thinks it of great force to prove purgatory. Does he not know that the Church of England and Ireland remembers or commemorates the dead in the very same way, at every celebration of the holy communion? "We also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear." Why does he not quote this as a proof of purgatory? The Church of England and Ireland "remembering the dead" should surely be as good a proof of purgatory as St. Chrysostom "remembering the dead."

"W. C. Search's" quotation from St. Ephraim is not proved to be written by him. It is, in all probability, a forgery. The passages of Scripture quoted in it are enough to prove this; for he could hardly have given interpretations of Scripture so manifestly false. And even if this passage had really been written by him, it would not prove that he believed in purgatory. On the contrary, in his 12th Discourse, he affirms, "that there is no middle between hell and the kingdom of heaven."

No. 8. "W. C. Search" says, he abstains from quoting Origen. We are not surprised at this, as we have already shown that Origen's opinion on the subject is counted heretical by the Church of Rome itself.

"W. C. Search" says he also abstains from quoting Arnobius, of Sicca. We do not wonder at this either, as we know that Du Pin, the most learned man the Roman Catholic Church has had in that kind of learning, has given us this character of Arnobius, of Sicca—"It must be confessed that he did not perfectly understand the Christian religion when he wrote these books."—Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 147. Dublin, 1723.

He also abstains from quoting Basil and Ambrose. We do not wonder at this either; for we expect to be able to answer on them, too, when they are quoted.

"W. C. Search" concludes by quoting Bishop Forbes, of the Church of England; forgetting that Bishop Forbes never believed in purgatory, and that, therefore, his having used the expressions that he did, is only a further proof that such expressions may be used by those who did not believe in purgatory; and that, therefore, those expressions have a different meaning.

The great mistake that runs through all such proofs of purgatory is this, that whenever Roman Catholics read of any prayers for the dead, or any commemoration of the dead, they always take for granted that it must be for getting the souls of the dead out of purgatory, even though the writers themselves say that it is for a totally opposite purpose. We have often exposed this fallacy in the LAYMAN, and no one has yet ventured to answer upon it. Is it not a striking fact that in all the proofs, such as they are, which "W. C. Search" brings from the Fathers of the first four centuries for the doctrine of purgatory, that purgatory itself is not so much as mentioned once in any of them? Could this be so if they really believed in such a place? Is it likely that Roman Catholics now, for the space of 400 years together, should never so much as mention purgatory once in any of their writings? Yet this is what we find in the early Church. Hence it is that Roman Catholic controversialists now, in trying to prove purgatory from the first four centuries, are obliged to rely on places which make no mention of purgatory, but are forced to rest their case on "commemorations for the dead," even though such commemorations, as in the case of Constantine, were clearly intended for souls supposed to be already in heaven.

We wish Roman Catholics would look at this fairly, and at once get rid of the absurd notion, that such remembrances of the dead are any proof of purgatory.

To enable them to do this the better, we quote here a case that has recently occurred. We have, in the *Freeman's Journal* newspaper, of April 2, an account of a solemn High Mass offered on that day for the late Dr. Murray, who had died on that day month. A sermon was preached at this very High Mass by the Rev. Mr. Meagher, P.P. of Rathmines; and how did this sermon begin? It began thus—"With the holy dead all is well. St. Laurence has but embraced in heaven the last and greatest of his successors, and conducted him ere now, let us trust, to his place in the quires of everlasting jubilee; yes, with the holy dead all is well."

Your city has lost a bishop, but has gained an additional patron and advocate in the skies." Now, it is clear that Mr. Meagher, when preaching this sermon at this High Mass, did not think it at all necessary to believe that the person for whom that Mass was offered was then in

purgatory. Now, if the Rev. Mr. Meagher, in preaching thus, at this High Mass, had been openly contradicting the doctrine of the Church of Rome, in the presence of all the clergy and people of Dublin, would he not have been censured? We know that his preaching was not censured but approved by all who heard him, both lay and clerical. Will any priest or authority of the Roman Catholic Church in the diocese of Dublin now pretend to say that the soul of Dr. Murray was in purgatory when that Mass was offered for him? Here, then, we have a plain and undeniable proof that the offering of sacrifice, and the making a solemn commemoration for a dead person, is no proof at all that the dead person is in purgatory. Well, then, when we read of any sacrifice or commemoration for a dead person, in the early Church, what right has any Roman Catholic to say that this is proof that that person was in purgatory, and that such sacrifice or commemoration could not be for any other purpose than getting the soul out of purgatory? We see plainly, in this instance, the falsehood and the fallacy of the argument. If the Church of Rome now thinks that there are other reasons for offering her sacrifice and making her commemoration now for souls that are not in purgatory, much more might the early Church offer her very different sacrifice, and make her commemoration for souls that she never believed to be in purgatory. How absurd, then, for any Roman Catholic now to say that sacrifice and commemoration for the dead cannot be for any other purpose besides getting the soul out of purgatory! Yet it is only by relying on this gross absurdity, contradicted even by their own practice at this present day, that any Roman Catholic can attempt to bring any other shadow of proof for purgatory from the early Church!

We commend this argument to the consideration of "W. C. Search;" and, until some one can answer it, we trust we shall hear no more of such proofs for purgatory from the early Church.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In reading the CATHOLIC LAYMAN of July and August last, several matters therein seriously engaged my attention, each of which I shall consider in order; and, first of all, your reply to Mr. Aylmer's question, regarding the second marriage of "her that is put away." I am sure you answer candidly, and state fairly, the law of the land and the practice of your church in these cases. But, then, another question naturally arises; the sincere inquirer after truth will be inclined to ask, how can the law of the land be at variance with the discipline or law of the church? Is it not the same power that gives efficacy to both? Is not the Sovereign of England, *pro tempore*, the supreme head of the Established Church in Great Britain and Ireland? and no act of parliament can be considered the law of the land without the royal assent and signature of such Sovereign. These, or such like questions, every person inquiring after the truths of this religion will propose to himself. You say, the "ecclesiastical courts of the Church of England refuse these divorces." Then we are to understand that "the ecclesiastical courts," &c., do not acknowledge the acts sanctioned by the spiritual head of these courts. This does not show "the whole body fitly joined and compacted," &c. (Eph. c. iv. v. 16), nor does it indicate that the church, which ought to be "one body and one spirit" (Eph. c. iv. v. 4), is careful to "keep the unity of the spirit"—Eph. c. iv. v. 3. Is it not, moreover, a fact, that in every case of a second marriage of "her that is put away," a clergyman of the Reformed Church is always found to administer the ceremony of such marriage? This appears to be a very strange feature in the Reformed Church, and one which ought to be shown as reconcilable to Gospel precept.

In page 81, July number, you ask—"What have the Fathers of the first three centuries to do with the Book of Maccabees?" That these Fathers have something to do with this book, may be seen in Clement Alexand., Stromat. Lib. 1; Cyprian, Lib. 2; Epist. 3 and 55 ad Cornel; and Origen, Lib. 6, page 290, et seq.; Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Again, with respect to purgatory, you ask—"What was the doctrine of Tertullian himself while he was a Catholic?" But in the interpretation of the passage which you quote from him, to prove what this doctrine was, I suspect you have made a serious mistake, to which I beg to call your attention. The words of Tertullian, cited by you, prove nothing, either for or against purgatory. When he says "grief for the dead is idle, and the impatience of grief is idle," he uses plain, unequivocal words, which cannot be misunderstood. He does not say that prayers for the dead are idle, or that sacrifice and alms for the dead are idle; and when you prove that "grief for the dead, &c., and the impatience of grief," &c., may be understood for prayers and sacrifice, the passage will bear your interpretation, but not till then. Tertullian does not affirm, as you state, that to pity them who are called away is to do an injury to Christ; but he says, "we do an injury to Christ when we do not contentedly accept their being called away by him, as if they were to be pitied."

Saint Nilus fully explains the nature of that grief which Tertullian deprecates, and which the Christian Church discountenances in all ages. He says—"To be grieved, to weep, to fast immoderately for the death of a relation, indicates unbelief and the want of hope. He who believes that he shall rise again from the dead will feel comfort, will return thanks to God, will change his tears into joy, will pray that he (the dead person) may obtain eternal mercy."—Lib. i., epist. 311, t. xi., p. 115.

In page 82 you reject the word "*repose*," which "W. C. S." puts into his translation of the passage he quotes from Tertullian; you blame him for using the same word again in Cyprian, "when it is, at least," you say, "a doubtful translation;" yet strange, you have not removed the doubt. "Upon falling asleep" is, at best, an obscure elucidation, and in perfect keeping with your notion of "*refrigerium*."

I request you will show from Scripture the progressive gradation of the felicity of the blest in heaven.

Cyprian's words—"non offeratur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebratur"—evidently denote actions subsequent to the time of his (*excedens*) departing this life, and can leave no doubt as to their precise meaning.

The same Cyprian is still plainer in Epist. 52, page 72, where he says—"It is one thing to be cast into prison, and not to go out till the last farthing be paid, and another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one in punishment of sin to be purified by long suffering and purged by long fire (or, as some have it, *diutine*), and another to have expiated all sins by previous suffering."

Concerning the doctrine of purgatory, as taught by the Catholic Church in the third century, nothing can be plainer than the words of Origen.

His words are as follow:—"For if on the foundation of Christ you have built not only gold, and silver, and precious stones, but also wood, and hay, and stubble, what do you expect when the soul shall be separated from the body? Would you enter into heaven with your wood, and hay, and stubble, to defile the kingdom of God; or, on account of these incumbrances, remain without, and receive no reward for your gold, and silver, and precious stones? Neither is just. It remains, then, that you be committed to the fire, which shall consume the light materials; for our God, to those who can comprehend heavenly things, is a consuming fire. But this fire consumes not the creature, but what the creature has himself built—wood, and hay, and stubble. It is manifest that, in the first place, the fire destroys the wood of our transgressions, and returns to us the reward of our good works."—Hom. 16 in Jerem., T. iii., p. 23. For more on this same subject read Hom. 6 in Exod. page 148. Hom. 14 Lev. page 259.

In page 94, August number, your distinction between *πρὸς* and *ὑπὲρ* is rather far-fetched, and will not stand the test of strict criticism; but waiving this for the present, we pass to your "*correct translation*" of the Vatican text, which, notwithstanding the importance you attach to it, proves very little, if anything, in your favour. *Περὶ τῶν τεθνηκότων*, you are found to render "*concerning the dead*," or "*on account of the dead*;" not a word about the living. There is as much said in the text about the unborn as there is about the living; and yet you say—"The sacrifice was offered, and the atonement was made, not for the dead, but for the living." You adduce the case of Achan as a precedent, in which you say—"There was sacrifice offered too, for all his sheep and his oxen were burned." As *ex parte* statements prove nothing, I shall, if you permit me, place all the incidents of Achan's death before the reader. *Approved version*, Joshua vii. 24—"And Joshua, and all Israel with him, took Achan, the son of Zerah, and the silver, and the garment, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he had; and he brought them into the valley of Achor." Verse 25—"And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones."

For an holocaust consisting of victims such as those mentioned in the 24th verse above, you have neither precedent nor precept, in the law of Moses. Joshua had no order from God to offer sacrifice. The Lord said to him—"Neither will I be with you any more, except ye destroy the accursed from among you."—Joshua vii. 12. No more was required, no more was done. Observe the Lord does not call all Israel accursed; but he says, except you destroy the accursed, &c. The fourth chapter of Leviticus is next to be considered. Verse 2—"If a soul sin through ignorance," &c. Verse 3—"If the priest that is anointed do sin, according to the sin of the people," &c. Verse 13—"And if the whole congregation of Israel do sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly," &c. Verse 14—"When the sin which they have sinned against it is known, then the congregation shall offer," &c. Verse 22—"When a ruler hath sinned and done something through ignorance," &c.

On a cursory perusal of the fourth chapter of Leviticus, it is easy to perceive that it relates solely to accidental sins, or sins committed by mistaking the laws, or the proper sacrifices and ceremonies, as ordained by Moses, for which they were bound to offer sacrifice